2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Nebraska

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season "leaf on" imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Nebraska. In other words, "How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?" Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, **NE**, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery "late". Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received, in Nebraska, 2871 of a possible 3415 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .841, for a rating of 84.1%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of "Satisfied". The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around timing of imagery delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q5, "Is the imagery useful for general reference activities, including disaster preparedness or response, or other planning activities?" Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q4, "Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?"

Q1		*Q2*		*Q3*		*Q4*		*Q5*	
Mean	4.169491525	Mean	4.228070175	Mean	4.438596491	Mean	4.491525424	Mean	3.7
Standard Error	0.121245587	Standard Error	0.10325997	Standard Error	0.093717246	Standard Error	0.077861847	Standard Error	0.157142857
Median	4	Median	4	Median	5	Median	5	Median	4
Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	0.931305024	Standard Deviation	0.77959568	Standard Deviation	0.707549692	Standard Deviation	0.598068193	Standard Deviation	1.111167799
Sample Variance	0.867329047	Sample Variance	0.607769424	Sample Variance	0.500626566	Sample Variance	0.357685564	Sample Variance	1.234693878
Kurtosis	0.863981839	Kurtosis	-1.218317472	Kurtosis	1.301679779	Kurtosis	-0.413612968	Kurtosis	-0.298360622
Skewness	-1.013363895	Skewness	-0.428213221	Skewness	-1.185851426	Skewness	-0.717250262	Skewness	-0.576416873
Range	4	Range	2	Range	3	Range	2	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	3	Minimum	2	Minimum	3	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	246	Sum	241	Sum	253	Sum	265	Sum	185
Count	59	Count	57	Count	57	Count	59	Count	50

Q6		*Q7*		*Q8*		*Q9_X2*		*Q10_X2*	
Mean	4.25862069	Mean	4	Mean	4.052631579	Mean	8.474576271	Mean	8.508474576
Standard Error	0.103069482	Standard Error	0.148461498	Standard Error	0.126206093	Standard Error	0.195441822	Standard Error	0.208488593
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	8	Median	8
Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	8	Mode	10
Standard Deviation	0.784953789	Standard Deviation	1.049781318	Standard Deviation	0.952835105	Standard Deviation	1.501217118	Standard Deviation	1.601431271
Sample Variance	0.61615245	Sample Variance	1.102040816	Sample Variance	0.907894737	Sample Variance	2.253652835	Sample Variance	2.564582116
Kurtosis	-1.195344978	Kurtosis	0.567934069	Kurtosis	2.103457839	Kurtosis	4.614395279	Kurtosis	-0.41683159
Skewness	-0.497871101	Skewness	-0.882017911	Skewness	-1.26295506	Skewness	-1.436920984	Skewness	-0.706799488
Range	2	Range	4	Range	4	Range	8	Range	6
Minimum	3	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	4
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	247	Sum	200	Sum	231	Sum	500	Sum	502
Count	58	Count	50	Count	57	Count	59	Count	59

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results